

international organization by a simple analogy: our relations with the Commonwealth are family relations; with the others, friendly business relations. Canada has been a member of the League of Nations since 1919, but it would be a bold man who would say that her membership in the League during all that time has had any injurious effect upon her relations with the other members of the Commonwealth.

I rather deprecate also the suggestion that has been made in some quarters that Canada should form a united front with the other nations of the Commonwealth at San Francisco. Canada is a nation, and we can stand on our own feet as a nation at San Francisco. I believe that if honourable members will reflect on this point they will realize that each nation of the Commonwealth will carry more weight and will be listened to with greater respect by the other nations if it speaks for itself as representative of its own particular part of the world. I think it might have a very bad effect upon the other nations of the world if they went to the San Francisco conference with the suspicion in their minds that the members of the British Commonwealth had been "ganging up" together beforehand to try to "put something over" on them.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: The whole trend of the debate in the other place, and in this Chamber, has been to emphasize the importance of the Security Council. I am rather inclined to ask myself whether in the long run the Security Council will be the most important instrument provided for in this set-up. I am inclined to think that in the future the real permanent developments of international relations are very likely to come through the Economic and Social Council provided for in Chapter 9, as well as the various organizations that will be tributary to it. At the same time, of course, it is very natural that our thoughts should turn to the Security Council, its future and its functions. We are in the midst of war and for the last five or six years our minds have been filled with war and threats of war and the prevention of war in the future. I suggest to honourable members that they might ask themselves whether an international conflict is likely to take place within the next three or four generations.

I was very much impressed by a remark made by President Roosevelt in the course of his famous "quarantine speech" at Chicago, delivered in 1937, in which he said that ninety per cent of the people of the world desire peace, and only ten per cent want war for the purpose of world domination. He was

obviously pointing the finger at Germany and Japan. What will be the position after this war is over? Germany and Japan will be hopelessly defeated, their territory and their population will be greatly reduced, and they will have been deprived of the means of making war in the foreseeable future. I think that is basic and axiomatic. If we look back on the history of western civilization it is rather interesting to observe that potential world conquerors turn up about once every hundred years. There was Philip of Spain in the seventeenth century; Louis Quatorze of France in the eighteenth century, Napoleon at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and Kaiser Wilhelm and his degenerate successor at the beginning of the twentieth century. I think history will record this war as more or less a continuation of the last Great War, and the two together as the supreme attempt of the German nation to conquer the world. If that historical perspective be true, it may well be that we have seen the end of attempts at world domination for some generations to come. What will the position be? Germany and Japan will be wrecked, ruined and repressed; the victorious Allies will be the dominant political force of the future world; the four great powers, the United States, the British Commonwealth, Russia and China, will have irresistible forces at their command.

Under these circumstances, is a war of worldwide significance likely to take place in the foreseeable future?

With regard to ourselves and the British Commonwealth of Nations there is no question. War is repugnant to us all, it violates our most cherished principles. There is no danger that either the United States or the British Commonwealth would attempt to engage in a world war in the future. I think it is equally true to say that there is no danger to be apprehended from either Russia or China. You can usually judge the future behaviour of a country from its past history. Neither Russia nor China has ever set out to conquer the world, and neither of them has ever given out the idea that they are the "master race" or the "sons of heaven" and that therefor they have an inherent right by their own destiny to conquer the inferior nations of the world for the purpose of ruling them. Both Russia and China are countries of vast extent and great resources which are largely untouched. Neither of them is a "Have-not" nation. Both have sustained enormous material damage in this war. I pause to suggest that for many years to come the energies of both these nations will have to be devoted to the reconstruction and development of their own countries and to the raising of the standard